UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,919	12/14/2004	Johan Paul Marie Linnartz	NL 020549	8891

24737   7590   03/16/2010
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
HUANG, TSAN-YU J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3685	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/517,919	LINNARTZ, JOHAN PAUL MARIE
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	TSAN-YU JAY HUANG	3685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2009*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

This Office Action is in response to the application filed on December 16, 2009.

The Examiner notes that United States Patent Application Publication paragraph numbers in the Office Action will be referred to as [####], #### representing the paragraph number.

The Examiner notes that an ellipsis (…) marks an intentional omission of a phrase from the original text, and is not shorthand for the actual phrase.

The Examiner notes that the usage of "etc" marks a continuation of the phrase from the original text.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-19 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claims 1-19 are rejected as set forth below.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument #1

Applicant contends **claims 1-4, 7, 9-10** are not unpatentable over the 35 USC § 103

rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant contends **claims 11-14, 17, 19** are not unpatentable over the 35 USC § 103

rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant contends **claims 5-6, 8** are not unpatentable over the 35 USC § 103

rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.

Examiner's response #1

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's argument #1, with respect to claims 1-4, 7, 9-10

have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection is maintained.

Applicant contends *Guddat* fails to teach a system that includes control logic data used

to control a processing means in accordance with the execution of the control logic

data. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As set forth in the previous Office Action,

column 2 line 52 to column 3 lines 20 of *Guddat* discloses an instruction cache unit 130

stored in a processor. The cited passage explicitly discloses "associated control logic"

that is stored in instruction cache unit 130 and is executed by the processor.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would determine

control logic data when executed to control a processing means (definition of control

data: "data used to synchronize and route other data or to manage the operation of a

device", *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary Third Edition, Microsoft Press*).

Furthermore, regarding claims 2, 4-6, 12, 14-16, 18, a recitation of the intended use

(arranged for/configured for performing an action) of the claimed invention must result in

a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to

patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is

capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey, 152*

USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967).

Furthermore, regarding claims 3, 8, 9, 13 the claims include non-functional descriptive

language. Claims 3 and 13 include characteristics of the necessary parameter. Claim 8

includes characteristics of the necessary parameter. Claim 9 includes characteristics of

the variations. (MPEP 2106 II; *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *In re Ngai,*

70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)) and

therefore cannot be used to differentiate Applicant's invention from the prior art

invention.

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's argument #1, with respect to claims 11-14, 17,

19 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection is maintained.

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's argument #1, with respect to claims 5-6, 8 have

been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1-4, 7, and 9-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,031,815 to *Heemskerk*, in view of United States

Patent No. 6,185,703 to *Guddat*.

3.   **Regarding claims 1 and 7**, Heemskerk teaches a system, comprising:

a storage medium (column 3, line 50–column 4, line 18);

read means for reading content data and control logic data from the storage medium,

the control logic data being uniquely linked to the storage medium...; (column 7, lines

27-41, the information is the content data and the address information is the control

logic data; column 4, lines 33-43, the auxiliary information being stored in a reference

pattern and not being able to be copied results in a unique link to the storage medium)

processing means, coupled to the read means, for processing the content data and

feeding the processed content data to an output (column 7, line 42-column 8, line 17,

the processors 43 and 44 compose of the processing means; figure 4, the first

processor 43 and the auxiliary processor 44 are coupled to the read/write head 31;

column 8, lines 24-27, sending data from processor 43 to the processing unit 50 is

feeding the processed content data to an output); and

control means, coupled to the read means, for <u>processing</u> the control logic data and for controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being <u>processed</u>. (column 7, lines 27-41, the system controller and demodulation means 32 compose of the control means, positioning the reading unit 31 is executing the control logic data, applying the auxiliary information to the system controller to control the releasing of the information blocks is controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being executed; figure 3, the demodulator 32 is coupled to the read/write head 31);

Heemskerk does not explicitly teach:
the control logic data comprising executable code or instructions.

control means, coupled to the read means, for executing the control logic data and for controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being executed.

However, *Guddat* teaches:
the control logic data comprising executable code or instructions. (column 2 lines 52 – column 3 lines 20)

control means, coupled to the read means, for executing the control logic data and for

controlling the processing means in accordance with the control logic data being

executed. (column 2 lines 52 – column 3 lines 20)

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to

modify *Heemskerk* with the features taught by *Guddat* because modifying the control

means to execute executable code or instructions for controlling a processing means

increases the amount of control allowed to the system for processing the content data,

thus increasing the functionality of the invention.

4.   **Regarding claim 2**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 1.

Heemskerk further teaches: wherein the read means are arranged for reading out

variations in a physical parameter of the storage medium, said variations exhibiting a

modulation pattern representing a necessary parameter for obtaining access to the

control logic data (column 4, lines 44-67, the reference patterns 2 are the variations in a

physical parameter; column 5, lines 13-16, the auxiliary information written in the

reference patterns is the necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic

data).

5.   **Regarding claim 3**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 2.

Heemskerk further teaches: wherein the control logic data is stored encrypted on the storage medium, and the necessary parameter comprises a decryption key to decrypt the encrypted control logic data (column 5, lines 11-13, the decoding key is the decryption key; column 6, lines 64-65, encryption methods known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention can be applied to the control logic data in addition to the content data because data is structurally the same, regardless of its function).

6.   **Regarding claim 4**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed. See the discussion of claim 2.

Heemskerk further teaches: wherein the necessary parameter comprises authentication data for the control logic data, and the control means are arranged for verifying the authenticity of the control logic data using the authentication data before executing the control logic data (column 5, lines 11-13, the access codes is the authentication data).

7.   **Regarding claim 9**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed. See the discussion of claim 7.

Heemskerk further teaches: exhibiting variations in a physical parameter of the storage medium, said variations exhibiting a modulation pattern representing a necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data (column 4, lines 44-67, the reference patterns 2 are the variations in a physical parameter; column 5, lines 13-16,

the auxiliary information written in the reference patterns is the necessary parameter for

obtaining access to the control logic data).

8.   **Regarding claim 10**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 7.

Heemskerk further teaches: comprising an optical storage medium (column 3, lines 50-

51).

9.   **Claims 5-6 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over U.S. Patent No. 6,031,815 to Heemskerk and United States Patent No. 6,185,703

to *Guddat*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,798 to Nerlikar,

10.   **Regarding claim 5**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention substantially

as claimed. See the discussion of claim 1. *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* does not

specifically disclose "the storage medium comprises an integrated circuit which contains

a necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data, and the read

means are arranged for reading out the necessary parameter from the integrated

circuit."

11.   However, Nerlikar discloses "the storage medium comprises an integrated circuit

which contains a necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data,

and the read means are arranged for reading out the necessary parameter from the

integrated circuit." (column 2, lines 4-10, the TIRIS cipher is the integrated circuit, the

TIRIS transceiver is the read means; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 7, the unique ID,

serial number, or BATCH number is the necessary parameter)

12.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to modify *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* with the integrated circuit taught by Nerlikar

because using an integrated circuit is a logical and versatile means for storing a

necessary parameter, a necessary step in order for said system to provide a secure

storage of content. The integrated circuit allows for sophistication in the control and

tracking of the digital content (Nerlikar, column 1, line 67-column 2, line 4). Therefore,

the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

13.   **Regarding claim 6**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 5. *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* does not specifically disclose "the read means are further arranged for storing a value of an additional parameter on the integrated circuit."

14.   However, Nerlikar discloses "the read means are further arranged for storing a value of an additional parameter on the integrated circuit." (column 3, lines 28-47, the post-manufactured rewriteable data is the additional parameter, the advanced readers making use of the post-manufactured rewriteable data is the read means storing a value of an additional parameter)

15.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* with the limitations taught by Nerlikar because adding an additional parameter on the integrated circuit is an efficient means of adding more functionality and allowing for more information to be stored on said system. It is also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to write data to an integrated circuit. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

16.   **Regarding claim 8**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 7. *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* does not specifically disclose "an integrated circuit which contains a necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data."

17.   However, Nerlikar discloses "an integrated circuit which contains a necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data." (column 2, lines 4-10, the TIRIS cipher is the integrated circuit, the TIRIS transceiver is the read means; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 7, the unique ID, serial number, or BATCH number is the necessary parameter)

18.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* with the integrated circuit taught by Nerlikar because using an integrated circuit is a logical and versatile means for storing a necessary parameter, a necessary step in order for said system to provide a secure storage of content. The integrated circuit allows for sophistication in the control and tracking of the digital content (Nerlikar, column 1, line 67-column 2, line 4). Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

19.   **Claims 11-14, 17, and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,031,815 to Heemskerk and United States Patent

No. 6,185,703 to *Guddat*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,568 to O'Connor.

20.   **Regarding claim 11**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* discloses the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 1.

Heemskerk and *Guddat* does not teach "to enable the host apparatus to establish that it

is installed in a compliant system and, when installed in the compliant system, to enable

the processing means to feed the processed content data to an output."

21.   However, O'Connor teaches "to enable the host apparatus to establish that it is

installed in a compliant system and, when installed in the compliant system, to enable

the processing means to feed the processed content data to an output." (column 3, line

66-column 4, line 16, the verify software-hardware association step 134 is enabling the

host apparatus to establish that it is installed in a compliant system)

22.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to modify *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* with the limitations taught by O'Connor

because such a method of establishing a compliant system is merely using an

authentication data protocol between the storage medium and the output, which in the

case of O'Connor is a CPU. Said method improves on said system by providing

another layer of security. Such authentication data protocols are commonly known to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Therefore, the invention as a

whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention.

23.   **Regarding claim 12**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 11.

Heemskerk further teaches: wherein the read means are arranged for reading out

variations in a physical parameter of the storage medium, said variations exhibiting a

modulation pattern representing a parameter for obtaining access to the control logic

data (column 4, lines 44-67, the reference patterns 2 are the variations in a physical

parameter; column 5, lines 13-16, the auxiliary information written in the reference

patterns is the necessary parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data).

24.   **Regarding claim 13**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 12.

Heemskerk further teaches:, wherein the control logic data is stored encrypted on the

storage medium, and the parameter comprises a decryption key for decrypting the

encrypted control logic data (column 5, lines 11-13, the decoding key is the decryption

key; column 6, lines 64-65, encryption methods known to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of invention can be applied to the control logic data in addition to the content

data because data is structurally the same, regardless of its function).

25.   **Regarding claim 14**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* disclose the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 12.

Heemskerk further teaches:, wherein the parameter includes authentication data for the

control logic data, and the control means are arranged for verifying the authenticity of

the control logic data using the authentication data before executing the control logic

data (column 5, lines 11-13, the access codes is the authentication data).

26.   **Regarding claim 17**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* discloses the invention as claimed.

See the discussion of claim 11.

Heemskerk further teaches "a multimedia terminal coupled to the output of the host

apparatus." (column 5, lines 35-44, the computer system is the multimedia terminal).

Heemskerk and *Guddat* does not teach "to enable the host apparatus to establish that it

is installed in a compliant system and, when installed in the compliant system, to enable

the processing means to feed the processed content data to an output."

27.   However, O'Connor teaches "to enable the host apparatus to establish that it is

installed in a compliant system and, when installed in the compliant system, to enable

the processing means to feed the processed content data to an output." (column 3, line

66-column 4, line 16, the verify software-hardware association step 134 is enabling the

host apparatus to establish that it is installed in a compliant system)

28.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to modify *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* with the limitations taught by O'Connor

because such a method of establishing a compliant system is merely using an

authentication data protocol between the storage medium and the output, which in the

case of O'Connor is a CPU. Said method improves on said system by providing

another layer of security. Such authentication data protocols are commonly known to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Therefore, the invention as a

whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention.

29.   **Regarding claim 19**, *Heemskerk* and *Guddat* and O'Connor disclose the

invention as claimed. See the discussion of claim 17.

Heemskerk further teaches the system according to claim 17, comprising one of a

Compact Disc player, a DVD player, a personal computer, a television system and a

radio system (column 5, lines 35-44, the computer system is the personal computer).

30.   **Claims 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. 6,031,815 to Heemskerk and United States Patent No. 6,185,703 to

Guddat, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,568 to O'Connor as applied to claim 11 above,

and further in view of U.S. Patent No 5,905,798 to Nerlikar.

31.   **Regarding claim 15**, *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor discloses the invention

substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 11. *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and

O'Connor does not specifically disclose "the storage medium includes an integrated

circuit containing a parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data, and the

read means are arranged for reading the parameter from the integrated circuit."

32.   However, Nerlikar discloses "the storage medium includes an integrated circuit

containing a parameter for obtaining access to the control logic data, and the read

means are arranged for reading the parameter from the integrated circuit." (column 2,

lines 4-10, the TIRIS cipher is the integrated circuit, the TIRIS transceiver is the read

means; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 7, the unique ID, serial number, or BATCH

number is the necessary parameter)

33.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to modify *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor with the integrated circuit

taught by Nerlikar because using an integrated circuit is a logical and versatile means

for storing a necessary parameter, a necessary step in order for said system to provide

a secure storage of content. The integrated circuit allows for sophistication in the

control and tracking of the digital content (Nerlikar, column 1, line 67-column 2, line 4).

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

34.   **Regarding claim 16**, *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 15. *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor does not specifically disclose "the read means are further arranged to store a value of an additional parameter on the integrated circuit."

35.   However, Nerlikar discloses "the read means are further arranged to store a value of an additional parameter on the integrated circuit." (column 3, lines 28-47, the post-manufactured rewriteable data is the additional parameter, the advanced readers making use of the post-manufactured rewriteable data is the read means storing a value of an additional parameter)

36.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor with the limitations taught by Nerlikar because adding an additional parameter on the integrated circuit is an efficient means of adding more functionality and allowing for more information to be stored on said system. It is also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to write data to an integrated circuit. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

37.   **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,031,815 to Heemskerk and United States Patent No. 6,185,703 to *Guddat*,

in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,568 to O'Connor, and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,070,154 to Tavor.

38.   **Regarding claim 18**, Heemskerk discloses the invention substantially as

claimed. See the discussion of claim 17. *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor does not

specifically disclose "the system is configured for engaging in an authentication protocol

between the host apparatus and the multimedia terminal to establish a common

encryption key for encrypting the processed content data before feeding the processed

content data to the output."

39.   However, Tavor discloses "the system is configured for engaging in an

authentication protocol between the host apparatus and the multimedia terminal to

establish a common encryption key for encrypting the processed content data before

feeding the processed content data to the output." (column 2, lines 29-56, the

authentication protocol using a common encryption key can be applied from two

computers over the Internet to a host apparatus and a multimedia terminal over a wired

connection)

40.   One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to modify *Heemskerk, Guddat,* and O'Connor with the authentication protocol

taught by Tavor because such a method of using a common encryption key improves

on said system by providing another layer of security. Such authentication data

protocols are commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to TSAN-YU JAY HUANG whose telephone number is
(571)270-7039. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 am -
5:00 pm Eastern Standard Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Calvin L. Hewitt, II can be reached on (571)272-6709. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TSAN-YU J HUANG/
Examiner, Art Unit 3685
March 10, 2010

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685